

FULLY INTEGRATED LIFECYCLE MISSION SUPPORT SERVICES (FILMSS)

NNA12412481R

Questions and Answers: SET 4

November 26, 2012

Question 1 - Can you discuss the difference in the FILMSS Matrix between the June 1, 2012 Draft SOW and Exhibit A of the October 26 Draft SOW?

Answer 1 - Some Core tasks have changed to IDIQ and the revised Matrix represents only Core or Core/IDIQ work. Purely IDIQ pieces were taken out. We'll provide an IDIQ Matrix for information purposes with the final RFP. The matrix shows the anticipated Core work for the first year. During the life of the contract the requirements may shift and change.

Question 2 - When will today's charts be posted to the website?

Answer 2 - The Industry Day Charts will be posted by close of business November 9, 2012.

Question 3 - Will SOFIA and/or LADEE be added to the FILMSS Support Requirements Matrix?

Answer 3 - Currently we anticipate LADEE and SOFIA requirements to be IDIQ. We will provide a separate IDIQ matrix for information purposes only with the final RFP.

Question 4 - Does Ames anticipate any potential Organization Conflict of Interest (OCI) within any of the programs that involves hardware development or technology development?

Answer 4 - Each company will have to evaluate their risk for OCI in their OCI plan and throughout the life of the contract.

Question 5 - Did you consider a free flyer or small satellite for a case study? You may want to investigate a cube satellite as a potential case study as this is not a widely used skill.

Answer 5 - Thank you for your comment, the government considered your request however, decided to leave the Case Studies as written. The Case Studies were selected on the basis of major elements of known work anticipated to start with award.

Question 6 - Is this a re-compete or a new procurement?

Answer 6 - This is a new requirement, however some work that is currently being done under the Programs and Projects Contract, NAS2-02090 will be migrated to FILMSS.

Question 7 - In the Past Performance section, is the limit four relevant contracts per company or four per team member?

Answer 7 - Per Section L.9(b) of the Draft RFP, "A list of not more than four (4) relevant contracts (government and/or industry contracts), each in excess of \$10,000,000 total contract value for the prime and each in excess of \$3,000,000 total contract value for the major subcontractor, received in the past five (5) years, or currently on-going, involving types of related effort."

Question 8 - What is the government's view of this contract, do you view it as more of a management contract with needed reach back for specific expertise needed to support the various missions? Or do you view it as a technology contract? For example, if you read the position descriptions and work to be performed it seems straight forward but then the SOW clearly put the impetus on understanding the science missions?

Answer 8 – Per the J.1(a) Attachment 1, Statement of Work: “This contract will provide program and project management support for such efforts as International Space Station (ISS) biosciences flight development projects (e.g., mission implementation, instrument development, and technology advancement efforts), collaborative science programs (e.g., astrobiology, virtual institutes), aeronautics research projects, and various Ames offices.

This contract requires the Contractor to provide management, personnel, equipment, materials, and facilities, not otherwise provided by the Government, to meet the requirements described in this SOW. This contract requires the Contractor to provide management for the work to be performed, to assure the availability of qualified personnel for timely response to requirements, and to manage all requirements.”

Question 9 - What priority does FILMSS have in regards to the other procurements (FILMSS, PESS, ISRDS, etc) that are in the queue?

Answer 9 – FILMSS is a key contract for NASA Ames. We are working towards our posted schedule of releasing the Final RFP in early January, 2013.

Question 10 - Are there specific things that the government is not getting on the existing contract today that you would like to see addressed in this contract? Are there any specific issues or problem areas?

Answer 10 – FILMSS is a new procurement. The government requirements for this contract have been presented in the SOW and RFP which has been developed on the basis of past contracts and future needs.

Question 11 - The OCI language is rather onerous in the draft and rightfully so; is it the government's intent to not allow the prime on FILMSS to pursue other development contracts at Ames? Or is this more for awareness that we need to be proactive in managing this risk and working with NASA to do so?

Answer 11 – The OCI clause notes to the contractor areas of potential conflicts which the contractor needs to address in their OCI plan.

Question 12 - In Section M, there is a significant amount of detail on what is being evaluated but not a great deal of detail about how it is evaluated. I understand that is primarily by design to provide the government flexibility in the award. However, it would still be helpful in understanding how the evaluation will be done and the relative importance of the factors.

Answer 12 – Section L specifies what supporting information should be included in the proposals and the specific format to be utilized. Section M of the RFP establishes the evaluation factors and sub-factors as well as their relative importance. Weighting and scoring for FILMSS is identified in Section M.3

of the DRFP. These evaluation criteria will be used by the SEB when evaluating proposals and by the SSA when making a selection decision.

Question 13 - Is the LOE described consistent with what is currently being used?

Answer 13 – J.1(a) Attachment 10 lists the labor estimate for the core work.

Question 14 - Would the government allow contractors to provide employees working on similar issues at other NASA centers as surge employees?

Answer 14 – Each offeror will have to address their plan for providing surge capabilities in their proposal for the government to evaluate.

Question 15 – Would we consider a small business as prime?

Answer 15 – Yes, the small business would have to perform the requirements of the contract.

Question 16 – We understand the overarching requirement is lifecycle management. We are trying to understand the Level of Effort shown which includes lots of engineers however, there are no staff called out for fabrication.

Answer 16 – The cost model allows for various types of engineers to be used to meet the governments' requirements.

Question 17 – Can you describe the PESS/FILMSS overlap?

Answer 17 – Please see response to the first question in Questions and Answers SET 2 at the following link: <http://prod.nais.nasa.gov/cgi-bin/eps/sol.cgi?acqid=150989#Other%2004>.

Question 18 – The labor categories are non-uniformly described. What are their duties?

Answer 18 – The duties are described in each core element. We will work on providing more uniform position requirements in the final RFP.

Question 19 – For the ISS there is no delineation between types of engineers, i.e., aerospace, guidance and control engineers, etc.

Answer 19 – We will clarify position requirements in the final RFP.

Question 20 – Does NASA want the IDIQ portion costed along with the Core? Or were they only provided for information?

Answer 20 – No, only the costing for the Contract Management Core Requirement and the Cost Technical Elements shall be provided. The sample IDIQ task orders were provided for information only.

Question 21 – Wouldn't SOW paragraph 4.1.5 more aptly fit under 4.2 vs 4.1?

Answer 21 – Thank you, yes, we will move this paragraph in the final RFP.

Question 22 – Is there any ITAR involvement with regards to the virtual institutes?

Answer 22 – Currently there are no ITAR issues involving the virtual institutes; if any arise they will be dealt with by NASA.

Question 23 – In Dr. Zornetzer’s presentation he emphasized that NASA Ames is interested in small affordable missions, yet we don’t view SOFIA, LCROSS or Kepler as small.

Answer 23 – In fact LCROSS is a small mission. Ames will be pursuing all types of missions going forward.

Question 24 – How important is domain knowledge?

Answer 24 – We define domain knowledge as the general concepts involving space and ground operations but not necessarily specific details of any given project. This would be very important. The contractor can learn the technical details of any given contract over time but they must have that knowledge base.

Question 25 – Is the Government looking for a partner with whom to work side by side?

Answer 25 – Yes, the Government expects civil servants and contractor personnel to work very closely together. We expect this effort to build on the complementary knowledge and skill brought by both sides.

Question 26 – virtual collaboration – does it need to be done on site or can it be done off site?

Answer 26 – We expect most of the work to be done on site including virtual collaboration work. Depending on the nature of the work some activities could take place offsite.

Question 27 – We notice that launch experience is not requested? Ride share?

Answer 27 – We do not anticipate that launch experience will be a necessary part of the support provided under the FILMSS contract.

Question 28 – The importance of effective management of diverse FILMSS requirements was heavily emphasized during Industry Day. Given the criticality of the contractor’s Management Approach to successful FILMSS execution, is the government considering an increase in the assigned scoring weight to greater than 200 points?

Answer 28 – Thank you, the government considered your request to reconsider the scoring weights of the specified weights applied to the four evaluation categories, however, the weight applied to management has been determined to be appropriate.

Question 29 – What kind of tools or management systems is NASA looking for in FILMSS?

Answer 29 – There are no explicit requirements for specific project management systems or tools as long as the contractor is able to demonstrate they understand and can meet NASA project management and systems engineering standards and policies.

Question 30 – Why was SOFIA IDIQ?

Answer 30 – There were sufficient programmatic and budgetary uncertainties with SOFIA that IDIQ was determined to be the better instrument.

Question 31 – Total value of the IDIQ is given as \$215M. Is the Core part of this?

Answer 31 – No, neither the Contract Management Core Requirement nor the Technical Core Elements are included in the total IDIQ value.

Question 32 – The matrix showed some work for Code Q. Is there any conflict with this work and the Safety Contract that was just awarded?

Answer 32 – No, there is no conflict. The FILMSS Core work for Code Q is for the Ames Management Systems which is not directly related to the safety contract.

Question 33 – L.9(a)A.4 Case Study 3 requires offerors to “provide a sample web page that addresses the Case Study and requirement of this task” Will the government please clarify as to how it wishes offerors to present this web page, particularly given the significant page limitation constraints? Can a link for a real website be included for the government to evaluate?

Answer 33 – The government will not look at live links. The offeror is at liberty to provide multiple snapshots of what linked pages would look like.

Question 34 – For Case Study 2, can a prototype be provided?

Answer 34 – No, as stated in Section L.9(a)A.3: “The Offeror shall describe its approach to providing expertise in collaborative technologies and the social aspects of multidisciplinary collaboration and tools across distance necessary to create an effective scientific collaboration between members at remote sites, including field expeditions, with other scientists in laboratories throughout the world”.

Question 35 – Orals – Under “How to manage complex technical”. Can contractor further talk about technical case studies during the oral presentations?

Answer 35 – No, Case Studies 1 to 3 can only be addressed in the written portion of the proposals per paragraph L.9 of the DRFP.

Question 36 – For reps and certs, do they need to respond to all the certs or can they reference ORCA for the DOD ones. (NASA ones aren’t in ORCA)

Answer 36 – Per Paragraph K.1, the offeror may note that the ORCA representations are completed electronically. Since the NASA representations and certifications are not included in ORCA they must be completed manually.

Question 37 – The links from the detail pages to the summary pages need to be updated.

Answer 37 – Thank you, we will update that in the final RFP.

Question 38 – In the core element descriptions, there are several acronyms which are not defined anywhere.

Answer 38 – Thank you, we will define those in the final RFP.

Question 39 - In the ISS Core element, the prototype is shown to be due in June 2012. Double check manhours for ISS, as it looks like 10 and 5 but then says more.

Answer 39- Thank you, we will correct these in the final RFP.

Question 40 - Core #2 hours don't add up to total.

Answer 40 - Thank you, we will correct this in the final RFP.

Question 41 - Can you provide an IDIQ matrix?

Answer 41 – Yes, this will be provided with the final RFP.

Question 42 – 4 relevant contracts per company for prime in past performance. It will be very challenging to fit the qualifications into the page count.

Answer 42 – Please see response to Question 7. We believe that 30 pages for the Past Performance Section is an adequate limit.

Question 43 – In his AMES overview, Dr. Zornetzer mentioned the space portal. Is this part of FILMSS?

Answer 43 – Currently there is no space portal work in FILMSS; work could be added on an IDIQ task order in the future.

Question 44 – Is there anticipation or expectation that contractor will bring in new work?

Answer 44 – FILMSS requirements include support for proposal development and innovative partnerships, either of which could lead to new work for Ames.

Question 45 – In first case study, it says all hardware either exists or needs to be modified. Does this pertain for all of FILMSS?

Answer 45 – No, this only pertains to the Case Study.

Question 46 – Technical understanding (oral requirement) To what extent should we address the requirements described in core element task descriptions?

Answer 46 – Per Section L.9(a)A.1, “The Offeror’s proposal shall demonstrate its understanding of the requirements of the Statement of Work (SOW)”.

Question 47 – Case studies (written) - To what extent should our response to the case studies address the requirements described in the core element and IDIQ task descriptions?

Answer 47 - Responses to the case studies should address only the case studies.

Question 48 – (written) – Are we correct that the emphasis of the evaluation of the case studies is our approach, strategies, etc., associated with each individual topic; rather than how we will avoid duplication of effort, leverage capabilities across tasks, etc.?

Answer 48 – Yes, for the Case Studies the evaluation will be on those items explicitly stated in Section M. (ie. For Case Study 1: “The Government will evaluate the Offeror’s approach, strategies, innovations, resource synergies, priorities, policies and procedures to assess whether it demonstrates a clear technical understanding of the requirements in the Case Study.

Question 49 – Key personnel (oral) what is the relationship between the Case Studies and Core Element/IDIQ task descriptions?

Answer 49 – There is no relationship. The Case Studies are purely hypothetical.

Question 50 – Staffing (oral) - Do the Core Element task descriptions and cost model represent the totality of core work in the first year of the contract?

Answer 50– Both the Contract Management Core Element (CLIN 02A) and the Technical Core Elements (CLIN 02B) together represent the core work in the first year of the contract.

Question 51 - The sample task for Education and Public Engagement Support where the Staffing Requirements are TBD. We assume those will be filled in for the final RFP. Also in this sample task order it is stated that Deliverable #8 is Performance Measure Reporting. Who defines/determines what the performance measures are? Or will they be included in the Final RFP?

Answer 51 – Thank you, we will update these for the final RFP

Question 52 – Atch J(b)1 Cost Model - The “Admin Asst” position on page 2 of Attachment J(b)1 Cost Model is missing the core requirement to which it is assigned.

Answer 52 – Thank you, this will be corrected in the final RFP.

Question 53 - Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 1 – ISS Utilization Office Support, Section B.1 - The number of Engineers and Biologists (10 and 5 respectively) listed under the Job Title section of Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 1 – ISS Utilization Office, Section B.1 do not appear to agree with the number of personnel listed under the corresponding Hours column (30 and 15 respectively).

Answer 54 – Thank you this discrepancy will be corrected in the final RFP.

Question 55 -Do we want team agreements to be submitted? To make sure companies are bidding what the team agreement says.

Answer 55 – L.6(b)(2)ii requires “a complete description, and documentation, of any proposed teaming or other business arrangements. Offerors proposing as a team, or other such business arrangement, shall fully describe this team or arrangement by outlining the relations, commitment, and responsibilities of the parties.”

Question 56 – Reference Attachment J.1(b) Attachment 3 Exhibit 9. This Attachment shows 1860 for the full time WYE. Is that the NASA recommended minimum productive hours to be utilized or are we as a contractor to determine the productive hours to be utilized?

Answer 56 – Since NASA is providing the cost model, the hours used should be standard. The standard hours are 1860. The cost model, core tasks, IDIQ tasks and cost exhibits will be updated to reflect this in the final RFP.

Question 57 – How do you feel about replacing employees versus re-badging?

Answer 57 – Per L.9(a)B.2. The offeror shall include: “Proposed approach to providing the staffing (skill mix) necessary to perform the requirements defined in the SOW, Core Elements, and IDIQ task orders. Include the assignments and the skills required for other-than-key personnel and the plan for incumbent skill retention.”

Question 58 – Phase in Plan (oral) will the bidders library identify the ongoing task orders and describe the work expected to transition to FILMSS?

Answer 58 – The work that is anticipated to transition from PESS is already represented in the core and the IDIQ sample task.

Question 59 - Attachment J(b)1 – Cost Model - Several identically titled labor categories provided in Attachment J(b)1 – Cost Model have differing education/experience/skill requirements based on the core element supported. For example, the requirements for an Administrative Assistant supporting NAI is 2 years of college and 5 years experience while an Administrative Assistant supporting NLSI or Space Science Astrobiology is BA/BS and 2 year experience. This difference in requirements poses a significant challenge to industry in developing Direct Labor Rates in Attachment J(b)3 Exhibit 6. Recommend the Government standardize education/experience/skill requirements for each Government-provided SLC regardless of the core element supported.

Answer 59 – Thank you, we will clarify the labor requirements in the final RFP.

Question 60 - Attachment J(b)1 – Cost Model - Several labor categories provided in Attachment J(b)1 – Cost Model have drastically differing levels of detail for the education/experience/skill requirements. For example, the requirements provided for a Web Master supporting the Strategic Management core requirement state not only the minimum education and experience, but also details on the ancillary skill sets necessary to successfully meet mission objectives. The requirements, however, provided for all positions supporting the Space Biology core requirement lack the necessary education or ancillary skill sets necessary to meet mission objectives. This lack of detail in requirements poses a significant

challenge to industry in developing Direct Labor Rates in Attachment J(b)3 Exhibit 6 and may result in drastically different offerors from industry – a challenge burdened on the Government’s evaluation. Recommend the Government standardize the level of detail provided in the education/experience/skill requirements for each Government-provided SLC regardless of the core element supported.

Answer 60 – Thank you, we will clarify the labor requirements in the final RFP. Please note that the Core Elements contain detailed information about the work to be performed.

Question 61 - Attachment J(b)1 – Cost Model - Row 38 of Attachment J(b)3 – Pricing Template Workbook, Exhibit 6 states “Core Technical Engineering Task”. Will the Government please clarify if this should state “Core Technical Task”?

Answer 61 – Thank you, this discrepancy will be corrected in the final RFP.

Question 62 - Attachment J(b)1 – Cost Model - Attachment J(b)3 – Pricing Template Workbook, Exhibit 6, Rows 39 – 52 and Exhibit 9, 13 – 21 and 53 – 61 provide SLCs to which offerors are required to propose direct labor rates. However, none of the SLC referenced are defined in Attachment J(b)1. Will the Government please update the above referenced SLCs with ones defined in Attachment J(b)1 or add the above referenced SLCs to Attachment J(b)1?

Answer 62 – Thank you, this discrepancy will be corrected in the final RFP.

Question 63 - Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 1 – ISS Utilization Office Support, Section B.1 - Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 1 – ISS Utilization Office, Section B.1 provides staffing for only a subset of the subtasks outlined in the ISS Utilization Office Support core requirement; namely, subtasks 1.3 and 1.5. Will the Government please provide staffing for the remaining subtasks?

Answer 63 – Thank you, we will clarify the labor requirements in the final RFP.

Question 64 - Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 1 – ISS Utilization Office Support, Section B.1; Attachment J(b)1 – Cost Model - The hours for the Administrative Assistant position listed in Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 1 – ISS Utilization Office, Section B.1 (1040) do not appear to agree with those listed in Attachment J(b)1 – Cost Model (940). Will the Government please clarify the apparent conflict?

Answer 64 - Thank you, the discrepancy will be corrected in the final RFP.

Question 65 - Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 5 – NAI Support, Section B.1 - The job title of the position provided in Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 5 – NAI Support, Section B.1 is listed as “2”. Will the Government please confirm the referenced job title should be “Contract Project Manager” as shown in Attachment J(b)1 – Cost Model?

Answer 65 - Thank you, the discrepancy will be corrected in the final RFP.

Question 66 - Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 5 – NAI Support, Section B.1 - No subtask is provided for the “Lead Web Applications Developer” position listed in Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 5 – NAI Support, Section B.1

Will the Government please provide the missing subtask?

Answer 66- We will provide the missing subtask in the final RFP.

Question 67 - Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 6 – NLSI Support, Section B.1;

Attachment J(b)1 – Cost Model - Attachment J(b)1 – Cost Model provides 2,080 hours for an Administrative Assistant position under core requirement 6 – NLSI. However, Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 6 – NLSI Support, Section B.1 does not account for this position and corresponding hours. Will the Government please clarify the apparent conflict?

Answer 67 - Thank you, the discrepancy will be corrected in the final RFP.

Question 68- Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 10 – Ames History Office Support, Section B.1 - Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 10 – Ames History Office Support, Section B.1 provides staffing for all subtasks outlined in the Ames History Office Support core requirement with the exception of subtask 4 Historical Preservation Support. Will the Government please provide staffing for subtask 4?

Answer 68 - Thank you, we will clarify the labor requirements in the final RFP.

Question 69 - Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 10 – Ames History Office Support, Section B.1;

Attachment J(b)1 – Cost Model - The hours for the Estimated ODCs listed in Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 10 – Ames History Office Support, Section B.1 (\$10,500) do not appear to agree with those listed in Attachment J(b)1 – Cost Model (\$9,500). Will the Government please clarify the apparent conflict?

Answer 69 - Thank you, the discrepancy will be corrected in the final RFP.

Question 70 - Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 11 – OCS Support, Section B.1;

Attachment J(b)1 – Cost Model- The title and qualifications for the sole position listed in Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 11 – OCS Support, Section B.1 do not appear to agree with those listed in Attachment J(b)1 – Cost Model. Will the Government please clarify the apparent conflict?

Answer 70 - Thank you, the discrepancy will be corrected in the final RFP.

Question 71 - L.9.(a).A.3, p. 75 – 76; Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 5 – NAI Support;

Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 5 – NSLI Support - The preponderance of the collaborative tool support requirements outlined in Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 5 – NAI Support and 6 – NSLI Support focus on virtual meeting and collaboration support, such as knowledge management, real-time/online meeting support, technology sustainment, and data sharing. The real-time data stream management requirements supporting remote field operating outlined in Case Study 2, particularly requirements a) and b), appear to expand the scope of the referenced Core Requirements. Will the Government please provide additional details of the anticipated real-time virtual mission support operations in the Core Requirements as reflected in Case Study 2? If such real-time virtual mission

operations support is currently being provided, will the Government please provide additional details on the types of tools being employed?

Answer 71– The case study is a hypothetical case of a type of requirement that might arise in the future but is not currently part of the core requirement.

Question 72 - L.9.(a).C.1.a) v., p. 79; Section L.9.(a).C.1.a) v. requires offerors to develop an integrated schedule which is “compatible with the software used by specific programs”.

Will the Government please provide details on the scheduling software currently employed on the programs outlined in Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements?

Answer 72 – Thank you for your comment, we have reviewed the paragraph and will delete the reference to “compatible with the software used by specific programs” in the final RFP.

Question 73 – Process versus speed and agility. There is no specific requirement in the mission support piece for process requirements.

Answer 73 – NASA as an agency has very detailed processes as described in Paragraph 3 of the SOW: “The Contractor shall comply with all current NASA and Ames Procedural Requirements (APR) and Directives, including APR 7120.5 and NASA Procedural Requirements (NPR) 7120.5, APR 7120.7 and NPR 7120.7, and APR 7123.1 and NPR 7123.1.” Ames might seek the offeror’s assistance in tailoring these processes for innovative small missions. (subject to Agency approval)

Question 74 – Staffing (oral) - What assumptions do we make about the amount of IDIQ tasking?

Answer 74 - Since IDIQ is a significant percentage of this contract the government wants to know how the offeror plans to staff IDIQ tasks. A change will be made to the DRFP, L.9(a)B.2.a: “Proposed approach to providing the staffing (skill mix) necessary to perform the requirements defined in the SOW, Core Elements, and IDIQ task orders. Include the assignments and the skills required for other-than-key personnel and the plan for incumbent skill retention. “

Question 75 - L.7.(c), p. 86 - On page 69, the DRFP states offerors shall have the proposed Program Manager and up to 4 of the offeror’s key personnel present the oral presentation. Recommend the Government consider allowing offerors to have their proposed Program Manager and up to 4 of their key personnel and/or corporate management staff with direct oversight of the FILMSS contract to present the oral presentation.

Answer 75 – No, we have considered the request however the requirement stands as written.

Question 76 - Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 13 – Space Science Support, Section B.1; Attachment J(b)1 – Cost Model - Attachment J(b)9 – Core Requirements, 13 – Space Science Support, Section B.1 provides 693 hours for a Project Management Support Analyst position. However, Attachment J(b)1 – Cost Model does not appear to account for this position and corresponding hours. Will the Government please clarify the apparent conflict?

Answer 76 - Thank you, the discrepancy will be corrected in the final RFP.

Question 77 - L.8(b), p. 72 - The DRFP specifies that diagrams, charts, tables, and photographs may use no smaller than 10 point Arial font. Since offerors will need to present some detailed information in graphics, such as process flows, the 10-point font size will be restrictive for “call-outs” on these graphics. Would the Government consider permitting offerors to use a font size not smaller than 8-point Times New Roman font for graphics of this nature? In addition, offerors may need to include representational or notional graphics that are not meant to be read in detail, such as computer screen mock-ups or form/report print-outs. Will NASA stipulate that these are exempt from the font size restriction as long as they are not used excessively?

Answer 77– Thank you for your comment, we have considered your recommendation and will make the change in the final RFP to allow 8 point Arial on graphics only.

Question 78 - L.8(b), p.72 - The DRFP specifies that a written page shall contain text no smaller than 12 point Arial font. Would the Government consider permitting offerors to use a font size no smaller than 12-point Times New Roman font for written text?

Answer 78 – Thank you for your comment, we have considered your recommendation, however, the Arial font requirements in the DRFP will not change.

Additional questions and answers will be posted shortly.